

Appl. No. 10/757,629  
Atty. Docket No. 8194C  
Amdt. dated August 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of May 3, 2005  
Customer No. 27752

### AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

Claim 1 (Currently Amended): An article to be worn about a wearer comprising:

a surface fastening system having a primary direction of load bearing, the surface fastening system including a first surface fastening element and a second surface fastening element, the first fastening element being joined to the article, the second fastening element being disposed so as to be generally in a face to face relationship with the first fastening element when the surface fastening system is in a fastened configuration, the surface fastening system further including an effective dimension Y extending substantially parallel to a longitudinal axis of the article, the effective dimension Y increasing from a distal laterally-outboard edge of the first fastening element to a proximal laterally-inboard edge of the first fastening element,

wherein the surface fastening system has different levels of resistance to disengagement in different directions.

Claim 2 (Cancelled): ~~The article of Claim 1 wherein the surface fastening system has a peak load in the primary direction of load bearing that is less than a peak load in the direction other than the primary direction of load bearing.~~

Claim 3 (Cancelled): ~~The article of Claim 1 wherein the first fastening element further includes a longitudinally inboard edge, the longitudinally inboard edge being longer than the laterally outboard edge.~~

Claim 4 (Currently Amended): The article of Claim 1, wherein the first fastening element further includes a lower longitudinally inboard edge and an upper longitudinally outboard edge, the lower longitudinally inboard edge being longer than the upper longitudinally outboard edge.

Claim 5 (Currently Amended): The article of Claim 1, wherein the second first fastening element further includes a lower longitudinally inboard edge having at least a portion of the lower longitudinally inboard edge being unjoined from the underlying structure of the article.

Appl. No. 10/757,629  
Atty. Docket No. 8194C  
Amdt. dated August 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of May 3, 2005  
Customer No. 27752

Claim 6 (Cancelled): ~~The article of Claim 2, wherein the peak load in the direction other than the primary direction of load bearing is selected from one of the group of greater than about 1000 grams, greater than about 1300 grams, greater than about 1600 grams, and greater than about 2000 grams.~~

Claim 7 (Cancelled): ~~The article of Claim 2, wherein the peak load of the fastening system in the primary direction of load bearing is selected from one of the group of less than or equal to about 1000 grams, less than or equal to about 750 grams, and less than or equal to about 500 grams.~~

Claim 8 (Original): The article of Claim 1, further comprising a chassis including an absorbent member.

Claim 9 (Original): The article of Claim 1, wherein the article is selected from one of the group of an absorbent article, a diaper, a sanitary napkin, and a body wrap.

Claim 10 (Original): The article of Claim 1, wherein the article is adapted to form a pant-like article and wherein each of the first and second fastening elements are releasably attached to form a waist opening and a pair of leg openings.

Claim 11 (New): The article of Claim 1 wherein the surface fastening system has a first peak peel load value when measured subject to forces in a y'z-plane through y''z plane which is greater than a second peak peel load value when measured subject to forces in a xz plane.

Claim 12 (New): The article of Claim 11 wherein said first peak peel load value is greater than about 1000 grams, more preferably greater than about 1300 grams, even more preferably greater than about 1600 grams, and most preferably greater than about 2000 grams.

Claim 13 (New): The article of Claim 11 wherein said second peak peel load value is less than about 1000 grams, more preferably less than about 750 grams, and most preferably less than about 500 grams.

Appl. No. 10/757,629  
Atty. Docket No. 8194C  
Amdt. dated August 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of May 3, 2005  
Customer No. 27752

Claim 14 (New): The article of Claim 12 wherein said second peak peel load value is less than about 1000 grams, more preferably less than about 750 grams, and most preferably less than about 500 grams.

Claim 15 (New): The article of Claim 11 wherein said y'z-plane and said y''z plane are each projected to about 60 degrees from an imaginary longitudinal line.